

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1.) Claim Amendments

The Applicants have canceled claims 81-156 herein. New claims 157-168 have been added. Accordingly, claims 157-168 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

2.) Examiner Objections - Claims

Claim 88 was objected to because the acronym "PS" was not specified. The Applicants have canceled claim 88 rendering the rejection moot..

3.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner rejected claims 128, 129, and 151 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, sixth paragraph. The Applicants have canceled claims 128, 129, and 151 rendering the rejection moot.

4.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 81-83, 89-95, 97-100, 103-108, 110-115, 128-135, 137-144, 146-151 and 156 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yi, et al. (US 7,356,146 B2) in view of Ahmavaara, et al. (US 2003/0169725 A1).

The Examiner rejected claims 84-87, 89-90, 96, 136 and 152-155 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yi in view of Ahmavaara, as applied to claims 81, 129 and 151, and further in view of Heden, et al. (US 2006/0165027 A1).

The Examiner rejected claims 101-102 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yi in view of Ahmavaara, as applied to claims 81, and further in view of Puuskari (US 6,728,208 B1).

The Examiner rejected claims 109 and 145 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yi in view of Ahmavaara, as applied to claims 81 and 128, and further in view of Golitschek, et al. (US 2006/0062167 A1).

The Examiner rejected claim 116 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yi in view of Ahmavaara, as applied to claims 81, and further in view of Heden and Golitschek.

The Applicants have canceled claims 81-156 rendering the rejections moot.

5.) New Claims 157-168

In the Applicants' previous response, it was noted that Yi discloses sending sequence numbers from a source RNC to a target RNC during lossless SRNS relocation, but does not disclose or suggest that a source SGSN sends sequence number information to a target SGSN. The RNCs are in the access network, not the core network. Thus, Yi does not disclose or suggest that the source SGSN sends sequence number information to the target SGSN. The Examiner now cites Ahmavaara paragraphs 0048-0049 and Fig. 3, refs. 11-12 for showing this feature.

Ahmavaara discloses a method in the network for supporting lossless relocation between 2G and 3G packet switched services. The network and the UE each retransmit packets which they are not certain that the other side has received. The sequence numbers are maintained, presumably to make it possible for the receiving side to remove duplicates. There is, however, no disclosure or suggestion of any signaling to/from the UE, for example, to request the next packet to send (which would improve the efficiency and avoid transmission of duplicates in the first place).

New claims 157-168 are directed to this aspect of the Applicants' handover process. Independent claims 157 (method) and 163 (mobile station) recite that the mobile station receives a handover command message from the network, and upon arrival in a cell of the target base station, transmits a message to the network providing a downlink sequence number status for a packet flow subject to lossless packet switched handover.

Basis for new claims 157 and 163 is found in the originally filed PCT specification on page 13, lines 19-27. This limitation is not disclosed or suggested by any combination of the cited references. Therefore, the allowance of new claims 157 and 163 is respectfully requested.

Claims 158 and 159 depend from base claim 157 and recite further limitations in combination with the novel and unobvious elements of claim 157. Basis for claim 158 is found in the PCT specification on page 16, line 25. Basis for claim 159 is found in the PCT specification on page 18, line 30 – page 19, line 2. Therefore, the allowance of dependent claims 158 and 159 is respectfully requested.

Claims 164 and 165 depend from base claim 163 and recite further limitations in combination with the novel and unobvious elements of claim 163. Basis for claim 164 is found in the PCT specification on page 16, line 25. Basis for claim 165 is found in the PCT specification on page 18, line 30 – page 19, line 2. Therefore, the allowance of dependent claims 164 and 165 is respectfully requested.

Independent claims 160 (method) and 166 (target base station) recite that the target base station receives a message from the MS providing a downlink sequence number status for a packet flow subject to lossless packet switched handover implicitly acknowledging downlink packages received by the MS, and begins sending packets to the MS starting at a next packet after the packet implicitly acknowledged by the MS.

Basis for new claims 160 and 166 is found in the originally filed PCT specification on page 13, lines 19-27. This limitation is not disclosed or suggested by any combination of the cited references. Therefore, the allowance of new claims 160 and 166 is respectfully requested.

Claims 161 and 162 depend from base claim 160 and recite further limitations in combination with the novel and unobvious elements of claim 160. Basis for claim 161 is found in the PCT specification on page 16, line 25. Basis for claim 162 is found in the PCT specification on page 18, line 30 – page 19, line 2. Therefore, the allowance of dependent claims 161 and 162 is respectfully requested.

Claims 167 and 168 depend from base claim 166 and recite further limitations in combination with the novel and unobvious elements of claim 166. Basis for claim 167 is found in the PCT specification on page 16, line 25. Basis for claim 168 is found in the PCT specification on page 18, line 30 – page 19, line 2. Therefore, the allowance of dependent claims 167 and 168 is respectfully requested.

6.) Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicants believe all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in condition for allowance. The Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for claims 157-168.

The Applicants request a telephone interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,

/Steven W. Smith, Reg. No. 36,684/

Date: March 16, 2012

Steven W. Smith
Registration No. 36,684

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-1572
steve.xl.smith@ericsson.com